DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 355 HE 012 091

AUTHOR Razor, Jack E.
TITLE The Evaluation of Administrators and Faculty Members--or Evaluating the "Boss" and Each Other.
PUB DATE 20 Apr 79
NOTE 16p.: Paper presented at the Midwest Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (Madison, WI April 20, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Characteristics: *Administrator Evaluation: *College Faculty: Competence: *Evaluation Methods: *Faculty Evaluation: Higher Education: Leadership: *Peer Evaluation: Performance Criteria: Performance Factors: Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance: Validity

ABSTRACT

Evaluation of administrators and faculty is examined, including the identification of evaluation instruments and clarification of procedures. After a brief discussion of the rationale for evaluation and the need for acting on the outcomes of the evaluation, the process of evaluating the administrator is considered. The criteria of organizational achievement and management are selected as indicators of administrative performance. Two approaches to examining administrators, the task approach and the process approach, are explored. Steps in the process are discussed and characteristics of a good administrator are summarized. Faculty evaluation is reviewed next. It is explained that the nature and components of the assessment instruments will vary with the purpose of the evaluation, and that the validity of the evaluation is no better than the validity and power of each of its components. Problems with student evaluations of teacher performance are posed and it is concluded that student evaluations should be considered as only one measure in the evaluation of the faculty. (PHR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED180355

THE EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY MEMBERS--OR EVALUATING THE "BOSS" AND EACH OTHER

Paper Presented, Midwest Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Madison, Wisconsin, April 20, 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jack E. Razor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JACK E. RAZOR
DEAN

College of Applied Science and Technology
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

The evaluation of faculty and administrators is interesting, complex and viewed with mixed emotions on the part of those involved in the process. For purposes of discussion I will dichotomize the variables and speak to each separately, though there are common linkages between the two. Prior to identifying evaluative instruments and clarifying procedures as to how an evaluation is to be completed, it is essential that there be a clear understanding of the purpose of the evaluation or why the faculty member or chairperson is being reviewed. Faculty may be evaluated for purposes of retention or reemployment, promotion, tenure, salary increments, reassignment within the department or system, and, of course, for the improvement teaching competency. Administrators may be evaluated for the same reasons, but viewed in a different context. Providing a clear understanding as to the purpose of the evaluation will facilitate its conduct and its acceptance upon completion. Conducting an evaluation for the purpose of improving teaching competencies and delivery systems, for example, and then using the results to distribute salary allotments is neither valid nor ethical, and causes much suspicion on the part of faculty and distrust for future evaluations. Once the purpose of the evaluation has been identified, and hopefully accepted by all, one then may proceed to select various instruments and/or resources to aid in the process. Parenthetically,

HE012091

I might note that I believe it is important that there is an acceptance of the evaluation on the part of those being evaluated and those doing the evaluation. If there is the belief by those directly involved in the process that the results of the evaluation will not be taken seriously or if a decision has already been made, and the evaluation will serve only to confirm an earlier decision, then little long-term good can be expected from the evaluation. In this day and age of accountability, I do not believe that anyone, faculty or administrator, will question the concept of evaluation, but I do know that if the concept is to remain viable and an integral part of education, we must protect the integrity of the process by giving credence to the results and then proceed to make decisions and act accordingly - - - - -granting tenure, denying raises, recommending dismissal prior to tenure dates, awarding promotions, relieving people of administrative assignments, etc. Thus, not only must we know, understand and appreciate why we are conducting the evaluation --------but which makes it valid -----we must also recognize that validated outcomes will be acted upon and the reliability component is in evidence. To do otherwise is to make the process a counterproductive exercise. Truly there is more potential for harm in evaluating and then failing to act and follow through than if we had not evaluated at all. Developing levels of expectation on the part of the evaluator and the person being evaluated and then denying feedback or behavior modifying suggestions creates an atmosphere of futility and an absence of credibility in the variable being measured or evaluated. For example, in some situations an evaluation for promotion to fill professor may be treated very lightly because the process is fraught with departmental politics, the criteria have little rigor, and experience has demonstrated that longevity and survival are the main ingredients in acquiring the rank.

In such a case, the evaluation means little and the rank has lost its significance and impact -- concomitantly, faculty are deprived of the respect which normally accompanies the rank on other campuses and they do not have the joy and sense of satisfaction typically associated with the work and sacrifice associated with acquiring the rank. To me that is more harmful than if we had not conducted the evaluation. The same could be said for tenure and for unjustifiably retaining an encumbent in an administrative position.

Having thus spoken to two major aspects of evaluation - - the beginning, delineation as to the purpose of the evaluation or why we are doing it, and the culminating portion, the decision-making and implementing component, let us now examine the middle portion of the process - - procedures, instrumentation, population, and time, or how, what, who, and when. There are certain commonalities inherent in evaluating both faculty and administrators, but for purposes of this discussion, I will differentiate between faculty and administrators by defining faculty as those whose primary responsibility lies in teaching and research and administrators as those who perform routine tasks such as scheduling courses and faculty, budgeting, care of facilities, as well as providing "academic leadership" for the unit.

Let us first examine the process of evaluating the administrator or, as the program title indicated, evaluate "the boss."

> . . . Although the evaluation of teachers and teaching performance has received systematic and sustained attention of theoreticians and practitioners in education, the attention given in our profession to the evaluation of administrators per se, and their administrative performance, can only be characterized as scattered and spasmodic.[1]

Although a multitude of taxonomies have been proposed and explored, two dimensions have withstood the test of time for evaluating organizational performance, which is an indirect though valuable barometer of administrative performance. They are organizational achievement, or if you will, program achievement, departmental achievement, college achievement, and organizational maintenance. Organizational achievement includes such variables as productivity which is reflected in faculty publications, papers presented, research grants funded, honors achieved by students being graduated in the program, innovative programs, teaching awards, quality of students, academic respect and influence on campus, etc.[2] Now many administrators do not want to be held accountable for the productivity of the faculty, but rather only for their own work. But make no mistake, it is the responsibility of a major academic administrator, chairperson and dean, and perhaps even a program director within a department, to provide for an environment which is conducive for productivity by both faculty and students. The administrator must be able to prove, push and pull faculty in such a way as to enhance optimum results. The administrator must be creative as well as practical. My point here is not to identify how productivity may be achieved, but simply to indicate that organizational achievement is a legitimate variable upon which to judge and evaluate an administrator and it is one which can be measured. This is a variable that is examined very closely in academe, especially by the superordinates. The dean, for example, may evaluate the chair, in part, on the basis of the department's productivity over a four-year period with regard to the parameters previously mentioned. This is also true with the vice president evaluating the dean on the productivity of a college and the board when evaluating the president on the productivity of a university. Too frequently the

evaluation of academic administrators focuses upon traits, performances and contributions of the administrator, while neglecting to reflect on the achievements, or absence of achievements, as the case may be, of those in the department or college.

A second dimension for which the administrator may be held accountable and one which is also capable of being measured is organizational maintenance.[3] Organizational maintenance includes such variables as job satisfaction of the faculty, programmatic growth, congeniality of faculty, absence of disruptive cliques, open communication, clear understanding of departmental policies and procedures, cooperative and supportive colleagues, excellent relationships with supportive personnel, etc. This is not to suggest that if everything is fine among these variables that the administrator is excellent.

> Harmony is not necessarily related to education. As an educative value, it would seem to have limited possibilities, particularly if the harmony is one of stagnation. Nor is survival and expansion without reference to educative values of much merit. A realistic examination of a department or college would posit that the care and feeding of faculty, psychologically and physically, is of instrumental not substantive merit.[4]

But when taken into consideration along with the organizational achievement dimension, it does provide a broad base upon which to evaluate the administrator, especially if a time frame is established for reference. Utilizing these two dimensions cooperatively in the evaluation is essential for understanding and predicting administrative performance. For example, a cause and effect relationship may appear when an increased emphasis on scholarly productivity in the achievement domain is proposed by the chair and it is accompanied by a slight decline in morale and congeniality in the maintenance domain.

My point here is to simply call to your attention that when evaluating the administrator it is essential that you evaluate the people and structure with whom the administrator interacts. It is not enough to evaluate only the tasks, accomplishments and traits of the administrator, we must also evaluate the faculty and the operation of the organizational structure, be that a program, department, college, or university.

> In planning for the evaluation of administrative performance, four considerations are essential: (1) the purposes of the evaluation, (2) the means for measuring performance, (3) the persons who will do the measuring, and (4) how often the measures will be taken. The reasons for evaluating administrators vary but generally fall into three categories: to change and improve behavior, to terminate services, or to reward role performance. An administrative evaluation system may be designed to serve any or all of these purposes. In any event, in implementing an administrative evaluation system, it is absolutely essential that the purposes for the evaluation be raised from an implicit to the explicit level.
>
> Regarding the procedures for measuring administrative performance, no entirely satisfactory method has yet been discovered or devised. Questionnaires, checklists, interviews, observation scales, time sampling, critical incidents, and other direct and indirect techniques for sampling, analyzing, and summarizing behavior have all been attempted with varying degrees of success.[5]
>
> Concerning the issue of who should participate in the evaluation of administrators, current suggestions range from including only the administrator's organizational superiors to including anyone and everyone who may "know" or "have a right to know" about an administrator's performance. Within the educational organization, however, at least the following should be involved: immediate organizational superiors, immediate organizational subordinates, and the administrator being evaluated.
>
> Whether or not broadening the base of participants increased the relevance, validity, reliability, and utility of the performance evaluation system, however, remains to be seen. If it is difficult to reach agreement on descriptions of actual administrative behavior, it is even more difficult to reach consensus on the evaluations of that behavior.[6]

Generally, administrators are evaluated by examining one of two approaches: the task approach and the process approach.

> The task or functional approach to administration analyzes "what" it is that administrators do and typically groups these tasks according to the following: (1) the instructional program, (2) staff personnel, (3) student personnel, (4) financial and physical resources, (5) the administrative organization, and (6) school-community relations.
>
> The process approach to analyzing the scope and nature of the administrative role is concerned less with "what" is done than with "how" it is done. Here again, several taxonomies of the administrative process have been drawn. Generally, the administrative process in education is seen as including the following stages: planning, decision making, organizing, communicating, coordinating, stimulating, and evaluating.
>
> The process approach to administration has been unduly hampered by some theoreticians and practitioners who seize upon a particular stage of the process as central and, with missionary zeal, attempt to subsume all functions, if not all processes, within it.[7]

Having agreed that the administrator, let's say, chairperson, is to be evaluated, and a definite purpose of the evaluation has been stated, let's say, retention in administrative role: and it's been decided who will participate in the evaluation, the dean, program directors, faculty, students, and the chairperson, and we know we are basically going to examine "what" he/she has achieved and "how," we now need to gather information from the various sources. There are any number of instruments available to solicit opinions of faculty on the performance of the chair. (U. of Kansas, Western Michigan Univ., Illinois State Univ.) The same is true for the superordinates and the students. Having obtained the information it must be very carefully weighed and considered. Its treatment, of course, is a function of the purpose. In this particular case, it is basically an either/or situation - - retain or relieve. If the evaluation were conducted for purposes of behavior modification or improvement, the response would not be so simple (though it would be less soul-searching and gut-wrenching).

Now, if you believe the task of evaluating the administrator is difficult, it is certainly no more difficult than being one. James Delahanty in describing what faculty want in a departmental chairman says that his/her job[8] is to fend the claims of other departments to courses, facilities, students, monies, research funds which the home department desires, justifiably or not, to avert the clash of student claims to grievance of poor teaching and advisement; and to maintain the proper distance between the faculty and the unduly inquisitive administration. He suggests that

> . . . the principal faculty test for departmental chairmen is the degree to which they enable the faculty member to indulge in the existential reality of "let me alone," while promoting its demise elsewhere. Unfortunately, for many chairmen, this notion of protection has also come to mean freedom from accountability in terms of what is going on. Thus questions of the relevance of course materials, the existence of curriculum patterns, the suitability of general education requirements, the internal consistency of course requirements--all these have been elevated to a position beyond investigation or comment. Often this is accomplished in the name of academic freedom as the indispensable element in the educational process. Demands for relevance and performance by the students, or public, or administration, are regarded an unpardonable intrusion.[9]

> The departmental chairman shall lead the faculty into green pastures and still waters. That is, the department shall at minimum survive and at maximum thrive with increased positions, increased enrollments, and increased budgets, preferably at the expense of the birth rate. It is no mean feat to maintain and expand without reference to performance or change: but, nevertheless, the ideal departmental chairman does just that.[10]

> On the one hand exists the fallacy of ascription - - blaming the administrator for anything and everything that happens, or fails to happen, in the organization. On the other hand exists the fallacy of avoidance - - believing that the effects of administrative performance perhaps may be known only to God. . . . . With surprising consistency, however, such ascription errors are made, assuming that because the administrator ranks highly on a "friendliness" scale then the organization is well maintained, or believing that because the administrator scores highly on the "productivity" dimension of leadership then the achievement of the organization will be great - ad nauseam.[11]

One final comment about evaluating administration.

> . . . It must be recognized that styles of academic administration are quite varied. There is no single successful or unsuccessful style. This is true not only because people are individual but also because a department may be ready for rapid growth or else to acquire prestigious faculty, and the very qualities which enabled a person to lead at one time-and-place may prevent him from being successful when the next stage is reached. Leadership ought always to be time-and-place tagged. . . . If leadership requirements are time-and-space tagged, a more flexible system or entry into and passage out of administration is needed so that leaders can be changed as new circumstances develop. . . . It might be desirable also to make terms of office more specific as a way of assisting administrators to think of assignments as temporal rather than eternal. This is not to say that there are no administrators who can maintain their flexibility or mind through life-long careers.[12]

Now to the evaluation of faculty. As with administrators, it is essential that we clearly delineate the purpose of the evaluation. Different criteria, procedures and resources will be employed when evaluating for salary increments than would be used when evaluating for tenure and/or promotion. It is encumbent upon those responsible for evaluating and making decisions to have different sets of procedures, policies and instruments for each purpose of evaluation. Certainly, the same people (faculty, administrators, students, external witnesses) may be involved, but their level of participation may vary from situation to situation. Similarly, evaluation instruments will be utilized in order to organize and standardize feedback, but the nature and components of the instruments will vary as to the unique purpose of the evaluation. The evaluation of faculty is divided into several categories, with each category receiving its own individual evaluation. Categories of faculty evaluation in higher education generally include: teaching, which includes mastery of content and pedagogical delivery; scholarly productivity which includes research, articles and books published, papers delivered, and service which will

reflect departmental and college committee membership, active involvement in the individual's professional organization, etc. In evaluating each area it is necessary to employ unique instrumentation and documentation so as to provide an assessment of the category or variable being evaluated. The validity of the evaluation of the faculty member is no better than the validity and power of each of the individual categories. The methods of evaluating scholarly productivity, for example, are considerable in number and vary in reliability from institution to institution, department to department within an institution, and occasionally within a single department from year to year. The same is true of the service component. Does committee membership count as much as being a committee chairperson? Does serving on departmental committees count as much as serving on a college committee or, indeed, a universitywide committee? Of what significance are elected positions in one's discipline? Is single authorship more scholarly than co-authorship, are three articles of the same magnitude as a text? Do refereed articles count more than those which are not? What is a refereed journal? If one gets reassigned time for research, is that individual benefiting more than those who conduct research, but with no reassigned time? And if not, why? Suffice to say the evaluation of each of these categories is complex but probably none more so than teaching. But on the other hand, none has been investigated more extensively than teaching. Since teaching is viewed, and legitimately so, as the primary responsibility of the faculty, and it is sought to be the most important of the three categories by a vast majority of the faculty and general public and certainly of the students, I conducted a limited review of the literature on the evaluation of teaching.

There is currently a great deal in the literature about student evaluations of faculty and there is an equal amount of interest and controversy on campuses and in schools about the validity of such evaluations.

> . . . Student ratings of teaching performance and course effectiveness are being extensively employed in higher education as one of several methods of collecting objective evidence for evaluating instruction. Such ratings allow for relatively effortless obtainment of information which can be easily translated into quantitative data. Generally, these data serve two purposes. They can serve a diagnostic function for self-improvement of instruction and they aid administratively in the determination of salaries, promotions, and tenure.
>
> Acceptability of student ratings as a valid measure for evaluating instruction has not been and is not now without controversy. Objections have centered around students' age, maturity and lack of experience as handicaps in judging instructional competency. Opponents also have claimed that a number of variables--grade expectations, class size, subject matter, class level, elective versus required courses, grade point average, charisma of instructor, etc. - - negate the validity of student assessment.[13]

After a fairly thorough review of the research literature one student evaluation of teaching, I would summarize the situation as being vague because of its complexity and the number of variables involved. For example, research clearly demonstrates

> . . . that the general character of the course being taught influences strongly the nature of the student evaluation. Within the physical education program, instructors of lecture-type, theory courses are viewed as having greater mastery of subject matter and being fairer in methods of evaluation than instructors of activity-type, skill courses. The latter instructors are, on the other hand, viewed as superior in their ability to explain and clarify their subject matter (i.e., in skill courses).[14]

Another variable, grade expectation, has a significant impact upon student perception of teacher effectiveness. Rodin and Rodin in discussing their instructor-rating data, present data which clearly demonstrate that high-grade expectations by students are associated with high ratings of instructors.

> . . . What is perhaps more dramatic is the sharp reduction in instructor-ratings associated with even a minor reduction in grade-expectation. Data clearly show how, particularly in activity-oriented skill courses, severely modifies instructor ratings.[15]

When using student ratings of faculty for purposes of awarding merit increases in salary it is important to note recent research by Alexander.[16] Alexander found that if ratings were perceived as affecting a professor's salary, the students would lower or raise ratings to punish or reward a faculty member rather than objectively report their perception of his/her teaching. There are, of course, numerous instruments employed with student evaluation, but it must be understood that student evaluations are just that - - student evaluation. They are fraught with the same problems and difficulties as peer evaluation and administrator evaluations and, of course, they are just one measurement of one variable in the overall evaluation of the faculty. It seems to me that if a mistake is made, it has been to put either too little or too much emphasis on student evaluations.

In addition to student evaluations of teaching, there is peer and administrative evaluation of instruction, scholarly productivity and professional service. In the evaluation of these variables, may I suggest one of the biggest problems revolves around the different expectations of the evaluators of the individual being evaluated. Too frequently faculty do not know what is expected of them in order to achieve tenure or rank or a particular merit category. When submitting materials to support promotion, for example, there is generally a difference of opinion as to the quality of work being presented and frequently there are even substantive questions about what is appropriate for submission. Well, obviously the system is inefficient and ineffective, if not inoperable, when there can be no agreement as to what is expected of the faculty. Clearly identifying expectations,

establishing criteria, developing guidelines and illustrative examples will greatly facilitate the evaluation of faculty. Faculty do not want to play games in this area, they do not want to be told one thing one year and something different the next. They seek reliability from committee to committee and administrator to administrator. Having several standards for the same variable, i.e., having several "types" of full professorships, is discouraging and somewhat demeaning to all concerned. This is not to suggest that criteria and standards should not undergo scrutinization and ameliorization, but it is important to inform the faculty and interpret the changes before they occur.

Particularly in education there are problems in developing an evaluative system because good teaching or competence is difficult to define.

> . . . Thus any system which attempts to get at evaluating competence in a pedagogical sense must face the fact that this system must be highly flexible and individualistic, at least until we can define teaching and learning outputs more measurably than is currently the case.[17]

While scholarly productivity and service tend to be quantitative in nature and complemented by fairly definable qualitative value judgments, teaching competence and its contribution to promotion, tenure and merit is extremely difficult to measure accurately and reliably.

In summary, when evaluating faculty and administrators, it is essential that you know the precise purpose of the evaluation, that the individual being evaluated is cognizant of the evaluation and is provided an opportunity to submit materials and, where appropriate, discuss contributions and environmental factors which impinge and/or impact upon his/her performance. Evaluation should come from superordinates, peers and subordinates, and it should be recognized that no one instrument and procedure

has been proven significantly better than another. And with this in mind, the most successful evaluation will be the one which has the confidence of the person being evaluated and of the evaluators. Dr. Harold Hodgkinson, Center for Research & Development in Higher Education at the University of California at Berkeley, indicates that every organization, including education, has two reward systems--one based on competence, and one based on service.

> The reasons for this are clear. As organizational imperatives change, new individuals with new specific techniques must be brought in and allowed to develop leadership positions. Thus status must be reserved for the new conditions which will bring about new leadership. On the other hand every organization needs a large cadre of individuals who will be dedicated to the organization. If this takes place, one is bound to reach that point where his specific competencies are less than they were when the individual first went into the job.[18]

If this is so, let us in education evaluate both with equal fervor and recognize the role each plays in the process of educating and preparing people for the future. Competence and service are mutually dependent and cooperatively beneficial.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Lipham, James M., "The Evaluation of Administrative Performance," The Evaluation of Administrative Performance: Parameters, Problems and Practices, William J. Gephart, Editor, Phi Delta Kappa Monograph, Bloomington, Indiana, p. 13.

2. Ibid., p. 14.

3. Ibid., p. 14.

4. Delahanty, James, "What Do Faculty Want In A Department Chairman," The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role, Balamp Publishing Co., Detroit, Michigan, 1972, p. 225.

5. Lipham, op. cit., p. 23.

6. Lipham, op. cit., p. 23.

7. Lipham, op. cit., p. 15, 16.

8. Delahanty, op. cit., p. 222.

9. Delahanty, op. cit., p. 222.

10. Delahanty, op. cit., p. 224.

11. Lipham, op. cit., p. 26.

12. Dilley, Frank B., "Comments on Administration: A Position Paper," The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role, Balamp Publishing Co., Detroit, Michigan, 1972, p. 95.

13. Zakiapak, Dorothy B. and Ronald R. Bos, "Student Evaluations of Teaching Performance," Journal of Physical Education and Recreation, Volume 49, Number 5, May, 1978, p. 64.

14. Ebel, H. C. and Howard Berg, "Student Evaluations in Physical Education: Role of Course Type and Grade Expectation," The Physical Educator, Volume 33, No. 1, March, 1976, p. 16.

15. Ibid., p. 16.

16. Alexander, Jerry H., "Don't Expect Objectivity in Student Evaluation of Teachers for Salary Purposes," Phi Delta Kappan, Volume 60, No. 1, September, 1978, p. 53.

17. Hodgkinson, Harold, "Unlock the Doors: Let Your Colleagues In - Faculty Reward and Assessment System," The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role, Balamp Publishing Co., Detroit, Michigan, 1972, p. 209.

18. Ibid., p. 208.